EPA Region 5 Records Ctr.



RCRA INSPECTION REPORT - INTERIM STATUS STANDARDS TREATMENT, STORAGE, AND DISPOSAL FACILITIES Form A - General Facility Standards

I. General Information:

		1. denote the terminal	
(A)	Facility Name: Amo	co Oil- Main Plant	360699
(B)	Street: <u>OLL</u> 5	TLOUIS ROAD	
(C)	City: WOOD RIV	ER (D) State: Illinois	(E) Zip Code: 62095
(F)	Phone: 618-251-	- <u>22 49</u> (G) County: <u>17</u>	alison
(H)	Operator: Amod	co Oil	
(1)	Street: <u>P.O. Box</u>	x 182	
(J)	City: Wood River	(K) State:	(L) Zip Code <u>62095</u>
(M)	Phone: 6/8-25/	2249 (N) County: Ma	Lison
(0)	Owner: SA	ME AS OPERATOR	
(P)-	Street:		
(Q)	City:	(R) State:	(S) Zip Code:
		(U) -County:	
		//6/84 (W) Time of Inspection	
(X)	Weather Conditions:	Thudy, 60°	
		·	

`(Y)	Person(s) Interviewed	Title	' Telephone
	El Sullivan	ENV. Consultant	312-856-5858
	Dick Summer	ENV. Engineer	618-251-2228
(Z)	Inspection Participants	- Agency/Title	Telephone
	SAME AS ABOVE Pat McCasthy	IEPA/EPS	618-345-4606
	Mike Grant	IEPA/LISET	618-345-4606
(AA)	Preparer Information		_ ;
	Name Mike Grant	Agency/Title	Telephone 6/8-345-4606
		· •	<u>-</u>
	<u>11.</u>	SITE ACTIVITY:	25
	Complete sections I through VII f facilities. Complete the forms (to the site activities identified	in parenthesis) in section=V	
<u>/</u> A.	Storage and/or Treatment 1. Containers (I) ② Tanks (J)	D. Incineration=and (O and P)	/or:=Thermal=Treatment=
	Surface Impoundments (K) 4. Waste Piles (L)	E. Chemical, Rhysic Treatment (Q)	al, and Biological
B.	Land-Treatment (M)	Treatment (4)	
c.	Landfills (N)		•

Note: If facility is also a generator or transporter of hazardous waste complete sections IX and X of this form as appropriate.

NOV 14 1984 -

REMARKS

Use this section to briefly describe site activities observed at the time of the inspection. Note any possible violations of Interim Status Standards.

A reinspection was conducted at this facility for several reasons. The main purpose of the visit was to review daily inspection reocrds concerning the "spray pond". Amoco's response to our CIL indicated that these records were available, which was not our understanding during the initial inspection. Also, it became obvious while reading the response from Amoco that some clarification was necessary regarding other units.

Other inspection records were not being maintained during our initial inspection. These records pertained to weekly inspections of the tanks and daily inspections of the South Flare Pit. Mr. Sumner showed us daily inspection records for the South Flare Pit, which are now being conducted. We also told them that the structural integrity of the two tanks must be inspected weekly. Even though all the liquids have been removed, these inspections must be conducted weekly due to the hazardous waste residues still contained within them. These inspections must continue until the closure plan is approved and closure is initiated. Mr. Sumner said he would start conducting weekly inspections and continue to do so until the closure plan is approved.

The revised Contingency Plan was not completed nor submitted to the local authorities, at the time of this visit. Mr. Sumner said the letters to the local authorities and their responses would be submitted to us.

The revised Part A withdrawing the water softening solids pits had been submitted to USEPA. Amoco also said when a response is received from USEPA a copy would be sent to our office.

Another area in need of clarification was the storage of reactive waste in impoundments. Amoco's response stated that reactive waste was rendered non-reactive immediately upon placement in the impoundments. We discussed with Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Sumner their Part A and their recently submitted closure plan, which showed SO4, the storage of reactive waste in an impoundment. We asked Amoco if TO4, Treatment of a Reactive waste in an impoundment would not have been a more accurate description of this waste management activity. Mr. Sullivan concurred and asked if a revised Part A was necessary. We told them to contact the Permit Section to see if it was necessary for their closure plan to get approved.

All outstanding apparent violations were discussed and were better clarified. We requested Amoco to supply a letter to us that would supplement their original response to our CIL giving the additional information discussed during our visit. Mr. Sullivan said this would be done and submitted to our office within the month.

